



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/083,626	02/26/2002	Karsten Isakovic	117040-55	1786
21324	7590	12/28/2005		
HAHN LOESER & PARKS, LLP One GOJO Plaza Suite 300 AKRON, OH 44311-1076			EXAMINER CASCHERA, ANTONIO A	
			ART UNIT 2676	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 12/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/083,626

Applicant(s)

ISAKOVIC ET AL.

Examiner

Antonio A. Caschera

Art Unit

2676

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 October 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 and 39-46 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 and 39-46 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 17 June 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d). The certified copy has been filed in the pending application.

Specification

2. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

The amended abstract comprises the phrase, "...is disclosed" (see line 2 of the amended abstract, for example) which should be omitted as this phrase can be implied.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Art Unit: 2676

3. Claims 1, 2, 42 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Fujita et al. (U.S. Patent 5,825,336).

In reference to claim 1, Fujita et al. discloses a remote operation apparatus having remote display terminals for processing and displaying video data with remote control processing (see column 1, lines 6-8). Fujita et al. discloses the apparatus comprising of a master display terminal and at least one slave terminal and further, Fujita et al. discloses an alternate embodiment where a plurality of slave terminals are implemented (see column 1, lines 62-64 and Figures 1 & 20). Note, since the terminals (master display terminal and multiple slave terminals) of Fujita et al. operate upon video data, the Office interprets the terminals functionally equivalent to a “graphics master unit” and “graphics client units” respectively. Fujita et al. discloses the master terminal receiving an input signal associated and set by using a keyboard or mouse (see column 6, lines 64-67) which the Office interprets functionally equivalent to the external input unit and input signal elements of Applicant’s claim. Fujita et al. also discloses the master terminal comprising an interface unit, which connects the terminal to a communications network (see columns 5-6, lines 65-3 and #013 & 014 of Figure 1). Note, the Office interprets this interface unit functionally equivalent to the first message channel of Applicant’s claim. Fujita et al. discloses the master terminal comprising a random access memory and a data receiving portion for receiving video data transmitted from a slave terminal (see column 5, lines 47-54, column 5-6, lines 65-3 and column 6, lines 54-55). Fujita et al. discloses the video data forwarded onto an operational data generation portion (see column 6, lines 55-63). Fujita et al. further discloses the master terminal using operational data, set via a keyboard or mouse signal, to convert display position data and video data, correcting for display characteristics on a slave terminal and then

Art Unit: 2676

transmitting this data to the slave display terminal (see columns 6-7, lines 64-6). Fujita et al. also discloses the master terminal computing and transmitting screen parameters indicative of quality, region enlargement ratio etc. to the slave terminal (see column 7, lines 7-10). Note, this data is inherently sent via the interface unit (mentioned above) and first message channel, to the slave terminal (see Figure 1), therefore the Office interprets such data functionally equivalent to the “first message” of Applicant’s claim. Fujita et al. discloses a plurality of slave terminals (see Figure 20) wherein each slave comprises their own random access memory (see column 5, lines 55-63) and an operational data receiving portion for receiving operation and screen parameter data from the master terminal via a communications network (see column 6, lines 30-34 #013, 015, 152 and 158 of Figure 1). Fujita et al. further discloses the slave terminals comprising their own interface unit for connecting the terminals to the master terminal via a communications network and master terminal interface unit (see #013, 014 and 015 of Figure 1) which the office interprets functionally equivalent to Applicant’s “second message interface.” Fujita et al. discloses the slave terminals comprising of a display unit for outputting video data (see column 6, lines 10-11 and #10 of Figure 26). Fujita et al. discloses the operational data, received from master terminal, being forwarded to a task control portion, to execute a “task” upon the data and then passes the task executed data to a display portion for display output (see column 7, lines 17-29). Fujita et al. also discloses the slave terminals acquiring video data from the display portion, that has been task executed, and transmitting it back to the master terminal (see column 7, lines 29-36). Note, the Office interprets that the retransmitting of task executed upon data back to the master terminal by the slave terminals, inherently comprises of some sort of completion signal to

end communication. Such, a signal is inherent to the communications network and protocols implemented by Fujita et al. (further see *Response to Arguments* below).

In reference to claim 2, Fujita et al. discloses all of the claim limitations as applied to claim 1 above. The Office interprets Fujita et al. to inherently produce a third message signal and transmit it to the slave terminals as the system can inherently operate using more than one request for remote operation as Fujita et al. discloses the apparatus as an apparatus for remote controlling a display device (see column 1, lines 6-8) which must be able to handle multiple requests for control.

In reference to claim 42, Fujita et al. discloses all of the claim limitations as applied to claim 1 above. The Office interprets the processing of Fujita et al. to perform in a functionally equivalent time period as Applicant's "real-time computations" since Fujita et al. discloses the apparatus to remotely control a display device from a users interaction (using keyboard/mouse, see column 1, lines 6-8 and column 6, lines 64-67).

In reference to claim 44, Fujita et al. discloses all of the claim limitations as applied to claim 1 above. Fujita et al. discloses a plurality of slave terminals (see Figure 20) wherein each slave comprises their own random access memory (see column 5, lines 55-63) and an operational data receiving portion for receiving operation and screen parameter data from the master terminal via a communications network (see column 6, lines 30-34 #013, 015, 152 and 158 of Figure 1). Fujita et al. further discloses the slave terminals comprising their own interface unit for connecting the terminals to the master terminal via a communications network and master terminal interface unit (see #013, 014 and 015 of Figure 1) which the office interprets functionally equivalent to Applicant's "second message interface." Fujita et al. discloses the

Art Unit: 2676

slave terminals comprising of a display unit for outputting video data (see column 6, lines 10-11 and #10 of Figure 26). Fujita et al. discloses the operational data, received from master terminal, being forwarded to a task control portion, to execute a "task" upon the data and the passes the task executed data to a display portion for display output (see column 7, lines 17-29). Fujita et al. also discloses the slave terminals acquiring video data from the display portion, that has been task executed, and transmitting it back to the master terminal (see column 7, lines 29-36). Fujita et al. also discloses each slave terminal comprising a CPU connected with the display unit (see #3 and 10 of Figure 26).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 43 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujita et al. (U.S. Patent 5,825,336).

In reference to claim 43, Fujita et al. discloses all of the claim limitations as applied to claim 42 above however, Fujita et al. does not explicitly disclose the master and slave terminals being browsers operating upon file formats of VRML, Inventor, Performer and/or X3D. At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement the remote terminal controlling techniques of Fujita et al. using browser type software specified for a certain file format since Fujita et al. already discloses the terminal as actual

Art Unit: 2676

computers, processing video data (see column 5, lines 41-63). Applicant has not disclosed that utilizing the terminal controlling techniques specifically in browser type applications operating upon VRML, Inventor, Performer and/or X3D files provides an advantage, is used for a particular purpose, or solves a stated problem. One of ordinary skill in the art, furthermore, would have expected Applicant's invention to perform equally well with the remote terminal video controlling techniques of Fujita et al. because the specific type of software and file formats used in this context, are a matter of design choice as preferred by the designer and to which best suits the application at hand. Further, the specific implementation of a browser with specific file types is seen as providing no immediate criticality to the invention at hand as the real scope of the invention is directed more towards master/client graphics communication/control. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art to modify Fujita et al. to obtain the invention as specified in claim 43.

5. Claims 3, 4, 39, 40, 45 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujita et al. (U.S. Patent 5,825,336) in view of Ishiwata et al. (U.S. Patent 5,894,312).

In reference to claims 3 and 39, Fujita et al. discloses all of the claim limitations as applied to claims 2 and 1 respectively above however, Fujita et al. does not explicitly disclose the master terminal comprising a third random access memory connected to second random access memory. Ishiwata et al. discloses an image processing apparatus connected to external machines, inputting data from the external machines to a plurality of image processing memories (see column 2, lines 22-25). Ishiwata et al. further discloses the external machines to be external computers (see column 4, lines 40-43), inherently comprising of respective memory units. Note, the Office interprets the image processing apparatus functionally equivalent to the graphics

Art Unit: 2676

master unit of Applicant's claims as the apparatus of Ishiwata discloses a plurality of image memories, seen equivalent to 1st and 3rd random access memories of Applicant's claims.

Ishiwata et al. further discloses the image processing apparatus accessing the plurality of memory units by computing addresses of data in the memories in a storing and retrieving mode (see column 4, lines 48-65, column 18, lines 48-62 and Figure 9). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the multiple memory addressing techniques of Ishiwata et al. with the remote control processing techniques of Fujita et al. in order to allow the remote processing apparatus of Ishiwata et al. to split use of image memory resources and provide simultaneous input/output from/to a plurality of slave/client devices, avoiding throughput degradation (see column 2, lines 17-21 of Ishiwata et al.).

In reference to claims 4 and 40, Fujita et al. and Ishiwata et al. disclose all of the claim limitations as applied to claims 3 and 1 respectively above. Fujita et al. also discloses the master terminal comprising an interface unit, which connects the terminal to a communications network (see columns 5-6, lines 65-3 and #013 & 014 of Figure 1). Note, the Office interprets this interface unit functionally equivalent to the first message channel of Applicant's claim. Fujita et al. discloses the master terminal comprising a random access memory and a data receiving portion for receiving video data transmitted from a slave terminal (see column 5, lines 47-54, column 5-6, lines 65-3 and column 6, lines 54-55). Note, since Fujita et al. discloses the master and slave devices connected via a communications network, the Office interprets that Fujita et al. inherently discloses a plurality of message channels as a communications network operates upon sent and received messages using a plurality of lines to communicate with target devices.

Therefore, Fujita et al. inherently discloses the second message channel associated with the master and slave terminals. Ishiwata et al. discloses a control section associated with the image processing apparatus along with each external machine comprising their own data selector (see column 5, lines 6-10). Ishiwata et al. further discloses the control section communicating with the data selectors, a plurality of memory controllers and a host computer (see #1, 2 and 4 of Figure 1). Ishiwata et al. discloses the control section to transfer various pieces of data, along with control signals, such as access position, or memory addresses, in the image memory units (see column 5, lines 22-25). Ishiwata et al. discloses the data selectors retrieving image data stored in image memory units by selecting the desired data bus and passing the data along to the external machines/computers, for further processing (see columns 5-6, lines 57-3). Note, the Office interprets that the transmitting of data back between the processing elements of Ishiwata et al. and Fujita et al., inherently comprises of some sort of completion signal to end communication as Fujita et al. discloses the use of a communications network for connecting master and slave devices.

In reference to claim 45, Fujita et al. discloses all of the claim limitations as applied to claim 1 above. Fujita et al. does not explicitly disclose a partial image switching unit for each graphics client however Ishiwata et al. does. Ishiwata et al. discloses an image processing apparatus connected to external machines, inputting data from the external machines to a plurality of image processing memories (see column 2, lines 22-25). Ishiwata et al. further discloses the image processing apparatus accessing the plurality of memory units by computing addresses of data in the memories in a storing and retrieving mode (see column 4, lines 48-65, column 18, lines 48-62 and Figure 9). Ishiwata et al. discloses a control section associated with

Art Unit: 2676

the image processing apparatus along with each external machine comprising their own data selector (see column 5, lines 6-10). Ishiwata et al. further discloses the control section communicating with the data selectors, a plurality of memory controllers and a host computer (see #1, 2 and 4 of Figure 1). Ishiwata et al. discloses the control section to transfer various pieces of data, along with control signals, such as access position, or memory addresses, in the image memory units (see column 5, lines 22-25). Ishiwata et al. discloses the data selectors retrieving image data stored in image memory units by selecting the desired data bus and passing the data along to the external machines/computers, for further processing (see columns 5-6, lines 57-3). Note, the Office interprets the data selectors functionally equivalent to the partial image switching units of Applicant's claim. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the multiple memory addressing techniques of Ishiwata et al. with the remote control processing techniques of Fujita et al. in order to allow the remote processing apparatus of Ishiwata et al. to split use of image memory resources and provide simultaneous input/output from/to a plurality of slave/client devices, avoiding throughput degradation (see column 2, lines 17-21 of Ishiwata et al.).

In reference to claim 46, Fujita et al. and Ishiwata et al. disclose all of the claim limitations as applied to claim 9 above. Fujita et al. discloses the slave terminals comprising of a display unit for outputting video data (see column 6, lines 10-11 and #10 of Figure 26). Fujita et al. discloses the operational data, received from master terminal, being forwarded to a task control portion, to execute a "task" upon the data and then passes the task executed data to a display portion for display output (see column 7, lines 17-29). Fujita et al. also discloses the slave terminals acquiring video data from the display portion, that has been task executed, and

Art Unit: 2676

transmitting it back to the master terminal (see column 7, lines 29-36). Fujita et al. also discloses each slave terminal comprising a CPU connected with the display unit (see #3 and 10 of Figure 26). Ishiwata et al. discloses the control section to transfer various pieces of data, along with control signals, such as access position, or memory addresses, in the image memory units (see column 5, lines 22-25). Ishiwata et al. discloses the data selectors retrieving image data stored in image memory units by selecting the desired data bus and passing the data along to the external machines/computers, for further processing (see columns 5-6, lines 57-3).

6. Claims 5-10 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujita et al. (U.S. Patent 5,825,336), Ishiwata et al. (U.S. Patent 5,894,312) and further in view of Matsumoto et al. (U.S. Patent 5,666,544).

In reference to claims 5 and 41, Fujita et al. and Ishiwata et al. disclose all of the claim limitations as applied to claims 4 and 40 respectively above however, neither Fujita et al. nor Ishiwata et al. explicitly disclose a synchronization master unit and synchronization client unit adapted to produce first and second test messages along with first and second test answer messages. Matsumoto et al. discloses a data communication system including a plurality of independent control units each controlling a plurality of independent functional operations (see column 1, lines 6-12). Matsumoto et al. explicitly discloses a “handshaking” method between a drive controller and an operation controller whereby communication mode settings are sent to the drive controller and upon receipt of the data, a settings completion data is sent back to the operation controller (see column 2, lines 9-16 and Figure 18). Such method is performed every time data is sent to the drive controller therefore, the Office interprets Matsumoto et al. to disclose a plurality of test messages a long with a plurality of test answer messages. It would

Art Unit: 2676

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the data handshaking methods of Matsumoto et al. with the multiple memory addressing techniques of Ishiwata et al. and remote control processing techniques of Fujita et al. in order to control the transmission and reception of data from one device to another, making certain that complete data is transmitted/received thereby improving and controlling the efficiency of the system as a whole (see column 3, lines 28-32 of Matsumoto et al.).

In reference to claim 6, Fujita et al., Ishiwata et al. and Matsumoto et al. disclose all of the claim limitations as applied to claim 5 above. The Office interprets the processing of Fujita et al. to perform in a functionally equivalent time period as Applicant's "real-time computations" since Fujita et al. discloses the apparatus to remotely control a display device from a users interaction (using keyboard/mouse, see column 1, lines 6-8 and column 6, lines 64-67).

In reference to claim 7, Fujita et al., Ishiwata et al. and Matsumoto et al. disclose all of the claim limitations as applied to claim 6 above. Claim 7 is similar in scope to claim 43 and therefore is rejected under similar rationale, as seen above.

In reference to claim 8, Fujita et al., Ishiwata et al. and Matsumoto et al. disclose all of the claim limitations as applied to claim 7 above. Fujita et al. discloses a plurality of slave terminals (see Figure 20) wherein each slave comprises their own random access memory (see column 5, lines 55-63) and an operational data receiving portion for receiving operation and screen parameter data from the master terminal via a communications network (see column 6, lines 30-34 #013, 015, 152 and 158 of Figure 1). Fujita et al. further discloses the slave terminals comprising their own interface unit for connecting the terminals to the master terminal via a communications network and master terminal interface unit (see #013, 014 and 015 of

Figure 1) which the office interprets functionally equivalent to Applicant's "second message interface." Fujita et al. discloses the slave terminals comprising of a display unit for outputting video data (see column 6, lines 10-11 and #10 of Figure 26). Fujita et al. discloses the operational data, received from master terminal, being forwarded to a task control portion, to execute a "task" upon the data and then passes the task executed data to a display portion for display output (see column 7, lines 17-29). Fujita et al. also discloses the slave terminals acquiring video data from the display portion, that has been task executed, and transmitting it back to the master terminal (see column 7, lines 29-36). Fujita et al. also discloses each slave terminal comprising a CPU connected with the display unit (see #3 and 10 of Figure 26).

In reference to claim 9, Fujita et al., Ishiwata et al. and Matsumoto et al. disclose all of the claim limitations as applied to claim 7 above. Ishiwata et al. discloses an image processing apparatus connected to external machines, inputting data from the external machines to a plurality of image processing memories (see column 2, lines 22-25). Ishiwata et al. further discloses the image processing apparatus accessing the plurality of memory units by computing addresses of data in the memories in a storing and retrieving mode (see column 4, lines 48-65, column 18, lines 48-62 and Figure 9). Ishiwata et al. discloses a control section associated with the image processing apparatus along with each external machine comprising their own data selector (see column 5, lines 6-10). Ishiwata et al. further discloses the control section communicating with the data selectors, a plurality of memory controllers and a host computer (see #1, 2 and 4 of Figure 1). Ishiwata et al. discloses the control section to transfer various pieces of data, along with control signals, such as access position, or memory addresses, in the image memory units (see column 5, lines 22-25). Ishiwata et al. discloses the data selectors

Art Unit: 2676

retrieving image data stored in image memory units by selecting the desired data bus and passing the data along to the external machines/computers, for further processing (see columns 5-6, lines 57-3). Note, the Office interprets the data selectors functionally equivalent to the partial image switching units of Applicant's claim.

In reference to claim 10, Fujita et al., Ishiwata et al. and Matsumoto et al. disclose all of the claim limitations as applied to claim 9 above. Fujita et al. discloses the slave terminals comprising of a display unit for outputting video data (see column 6, lines 10-11 and #10 of Figure 26). Fujita et al. discloses the operational data, received from master terminal, being forwarded to a task control portion, to execute a "task" upon the data and the passes the task executed data to a display portion for display output (see column 7, lines 17-29). Fujita et al. also discloses the slave terminals acquiring video data from the display portion, that has been task executed, and transmitting it back to the master terminal (see column 7, lines 29-36). Fujita et al. also discloses each slave terminal comprising a CPU connected with the display unit (see #3 and 10 of Figure 26). Ishiwata et al. discloses the control section to transfer various pieces of data, along with control signals, such as access position, or memory addresses, in the image memory units (see column 5, lines 22-25). Ishiwata et al. discloses the data selectors retrieving image data stored in image memory units by selecting the desired data bus and passing the data along to the external machines/computers, for further processing (see columns 5-6, lines 57-3).

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments, see page 17 of Applicant's Remarks, filed 10/05/05, with respect to the objection of the drawings have been fully considered and are persuasive. The object of the drawings has been withdrawn.

8. Applicant's arguments, see page 18 of Applicant's Remarks, filed 10/05/05, with respect to the objection of the specification in view of reference no. C2 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The objection of the specification in view of reference no. C2 has been withdrawn. Note, minor informalities still exist within the abstract (see above) and therefore an objection of the specification is maintained.

9. Applicant's arguments filed 10/05/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In reference to claims 1-10 and 39-46, which are based upon the Fujita et al. reference, Applicant argues that Fujita et al., (1) "...does not teach or suggest a graphics master unit adapter to receive a first scene graphics data file which defines objects and/or events," and (2) "...does not teach or suggest at least two graphics client units adapted to receive a second scene graphics data file," (see 2nd paragraph, page 19 of Applicant's Remarks). Further, Applicant goes on to described that there is no talk about scene graphics data files at all (3) nor is there any discussion of synchronized output of image data (4) (see 2nd paragraph, page 19 of Applicant's Remarks).

In response to Applicant's first and third arguments (1 & 3), the Office disagrees with Applicant's statement that the master graphics unit does not receive a first scene graphics data file which defines objects. The Office has recited above, Fujita et al. discloses the master terminal comprising a random access memory and a data receiving portion for receiving video data transmitted from a slave terminal (see column 5, lines 47-54, column 5-6, lines 65-3 and

Art Unit: 2676

column 6, lines 54-55). The Office interprets that since the master terminal of Fujita et al. receives and stores video data, the video data received could and is broadly interpreted as graphics data which defines objects. Further, since files are made up of data and Fujita et al. discloses sending video data, the Office interprets Fujita et al. to inherently send files. Additional support for this interpretation can be found in the attached NPL, document which defines the term “file” as it pertains to computers as, “...a stream (sequence) of bits...” (see “Computer file,” Wikipedia.org, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Computer_file, last modified 12/04/05, date accessed 12/15/05). Even further, support for such an interpretation is found in Fujita et al. in column 7, lines 41-44, wherein Fujita et al. discloses the video data as a still picture which, still pictures, are commonly configured as a file. Certainly, the video data sent to the master terminal is a “stream (sequence) of bits” and therefore, the Office maintains its rejection based upon Fujita et al.

In reference to Applicant’s second and third arguments (2 & 3), the Office disagrees with Applicant’s statement that at least two graphics client units adapted to receive a second scene graphics data file are present in Fujita et al. The Office has recited above, Fujita et al. discloses a plurality of slave terminals (see Figure 20) wherein each slave comprises their own random access memory (see column 5, lines 55-63) and an operational data receiving portion for receiving operation and screen parameter data from the master terminal via a communications network (see column 6, lines 30-34 #013, 015, 152 and 158 of Figure 1). The Office interprets this operation and screen parameter data functionally equivalent to the scene graphics data file of Applicant’s claim since this data provides definitions for scene objects and events. For example, the screen parameter data defines the position of an image in the display (see column 6, lines 10-

Art Unit: 2676

15) while operational data defines input data from the input signal (see column 6, lines 22-26) which is seen as functionally equivalent to data defining a scene. Similarly, as seen above with respect to the terms, “data” and “file,” the term “file” as it pertains to computers is defined as, “...a stream (sequence) of bits...” (see “Computer file,” Wikipedia.org, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Computer_file, last modified 12/04/05, date accessed 12/15/05).

Certainly, the screen parameter and operational data sent to the slave terminals is a “stream (sequence) of bits” and therefore, the Office maintains its rejection based upon Fujita et al.

Finally, in reference to Applicant’s fourth argument (4), the Office disagrees with Applicant’s statement that Fujita et al. is not concerned with the synchronization of data communicating between master and slave terminals. The Office has recited above, that the retransmitting of task executed upon data back to the master terminal by the slave terminals, inherently comprises of some sort of completion signal to end communication. Such, a signal is inherent to the communications network and protocols implemented by Fujita et al. Further, since master and slave terminals are interfaced through a network communication interface, exchanging of data through networks is inherently synchronized using certain protocols whether it’d be, TCP, UDP, FTP etc. Even further, Fujita et al. suggests synchronization between the master and slave terminals as Fujita et al. discloses an assumption is made that the master terminal transmits a transmission speed (frame rate) to the slave terminal(s) (see column 7, lines 39-48). Therefore, the Office maintains its rejection based upon Fujita et al.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Antonio Caschera whose telephone number is (571) 272-7781. The examiner can normally be reached Monday-Thursday and alternate Fridays between 7:30 AM and 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew Bella, can be reached at (571) 272-7778.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Art Unit: 2676

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

aac
AK
12/15/05



MATTHEW C. BELLA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600